

REMARKS

The last office action has been carefully considered.

Independent claims 12, 24 and 30 are not taught or suggested by the cited prior art in the last office.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims in view of the amendments to the claims and the following arguments.

The claimed invention relates to a toy having a security alarm device. The security alarm device for the toy has an armed and an unarmed state and is responsive to at least one sensor in its armed state. A controller causes a signaling device to generate a signal in response to the activation of the at least one sensor in the armed state of the security alarm device for the toy and causes the signaling device to stop generating the signal when the alarm device is placed in its unarmed state.

The patent to Sanders et al does not relate to a toy or security device for a toy. One skilled in the art would not have considered this reference in attempting to create a toy with a toy security device. Further it is respectfully submitted that Sanders is non-analogous art.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is engaging in impermissible hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Sanders alone or in combination with the other cited prior art does not teach or suggest the claimed invention of amended claims 2, 24 and 30.

In view of the above amendments and arguments, it is respectfully requested that the rejections be withdrawn and that claims remaining in the present application be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted



Date Oct. 23, 2003

Richard B. Klar
Reg. No. 31, 385
875 Ave of the Americas, Suite 2301
New York, NY 10001
Tel: 212-279-2991
Fax 212-279-3098